REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 8, 10, 12, and 17-19 have been amended; new claim 20 has been introduced. With these amendments, claims 1-20 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 17, and 18 are independent.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-4, 8-9, and 12-19 are rejected as being unpatentable over Cardillo (NPL document entitled "Phonetic Searching vs. LVCSR: How to Find What You Really Want in Audio Archives") in view of Wolf (U.S. 3002/0204492). We submit, however, that neither Cardillo nor Wolf, alone or in any proper combination, describes or suggests a method comprising, among other features, "receiving input from a user ... wherein the input includes a first input from the user identifying a first instance of an entire spoken event of interest ... and a second input from the user identifying a second instance of the entire spoken event of interest," as recited in amended claim 1.

The Examiner has identified Cardillo's "combination of brain cancer and cell phone" as corresponding to the claimed spoken event of interest (Office Action p. 4). The Examiner also identifies the occurrence of "brain cancer" in Cardillo's first set of audio signals as corresponding to the claimed "first instance" of the spoken event of interest, and identifies the occurrence of "cell phone" in Cardillo's first set of audio signals as corresponding to the claimed "second instance" of the spoken event of interest.

Amended claim 1 requires that both the first instance and the second instance be of an "*entire* spoken event of interest" (emphasis added). Let us assume *arguendo* that the Examiner is correct in identifying the combination of "brain cancer and cell phone" as a spoken event of interest in Cardillo. In this case, however, the occurrence of "brain cancer" in Cardillo's first set of audio signals cannot be a first instance of an *entire* spoken event of interest; rather, "brain cancer" is only a portion of the designated spoken event of interest. Likewise, the occurrence of "cell phone" in Cardillo's first set of audio signals cannot be a second occurrence of the *entire* spoken event of interest, but rather is only a portion of the spoken event of interest.

More generally, there is no feature in Cardillo that can be read as corresponding to the claimed spoken event of interest such that an input from a user includes "a first input ... identifying a first instance of an entire spoken event of interest ... and a second input ... identifying a second instance of the entire spoken event of interest." Likewise, there is no feature in Wolf that that can be read as corresponding to this limitation.

For at least this reason, independent claim 1 is patentable over Cardillo and Wolf, alone or in any proper combination. Since claims 2-4, 8-9, and 12-16 depend from claim 1, these claims are also patentable for at least the same reason claim 1 is patentable.

Similarly, the tangible computer-readable medium of independent claim 17 and the system of independent claim 18 are patentable for the same reasons independent claim 1 is patentable. Dependent claim 19, which depends from claim 18, is also patentable for at least the same reasons claim 18 is patentable.

Claims 5-7 and 10-11 are rejected as being unpatentable over Cardillo in view of Wolf and further in view of Ferrieux (NPL document entitled "Phoneme-Level Indexing for Fast and Vocabulary-Independent Voice/Voice Retrieval). These claims depend from claim 1, which is patentable as discussed above. Since Ferrieux does not remedy the deficiencies of Cardillo and Wolf, claims 5-7 and 10-11 are thus patentable for at least the same reasons claim 1 is patentable.

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

The Petition for Extension of Time fee in the amount of $245 and the Request for Continued Examination fee in the amount of $405 are being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 50-4189, referencing Attorney Docket No. 30004-004US1.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/3/2010

Mandy Jubang
Reg. No. 45,884

Customer No. 69713
Occhiuti Rohlicek & Tsao LLP
10 Fawcett Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
Telephone: (617) 500-2504
Facsimile: (617) 500-2499